

WASHINGTON.

"Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

SATURDAY, JULY 17, 1852.

THE WHIG PROTESTANTS.

Of the Protest published in this paper some days ago, against the Whig Convention candidate for the Presidency, having been in no haste to speak at all, we shall now endeavor to do so with calmness, and without derogating from the respect personally due to the gentlemen whose names are appended to it, but with the plainness and truthfulness which our readers have a right to expect from us.

The right of these gentlemen individually to entertain and express opinions, dissentient (or otherwise) to those of the body of the Whig party, no one will seriously dispute. Neither can their right to publish such opinions be drawn into question. The freedom of speech and the freedom of the press are sacredly protected by the Constitution under which we live, and the gentlemen referred to, in putting their names to and publishing that paper, have done no more than exercise those undoubted rights.

Whatever of consideration and weight opinions of gentlemen, of the character and standing of the individual signers of that paper, are entitled to, it ought to carry with it. But its privilege and its immunity extend no further.

The Protest (as for brevity's sake we shall term it) acquires no additional force from the apparent fact of its being the result of a combination of the signers for a common purpose; that is to say, had each of them, instead of uniting in this Protest, addressed to his friends at home, or to the Public, separate letters of the same import—as some of them actually did before the issuing of that Protest—every proper purpose of the combination would have been as well accomplished as by the joint address.

Nor does the elevated station of Members of Congress, occupied by the signers of the Protest, add to it any authority beyond what it derives from their individual personal respectability; for the subject and the object of it are foreign to their mission, as such. It is true, much of the time of Congress, during the preceding six or seven months, had been employed, in the House of Representatives especially, in debating the claims and qualifications of divers persons deemed fit (or unfit) by one speaker or another, to fill the Presidential office. But the fact of such occupation of the time of Congress in debates upon questions not within its jurisdiction—such employment being, moreover, without precedent as well as without authority—could certainly confer no authority upon acts done by members of Congress outside of the walls of the Capitol.

There is nothing, in short, in the circumstances of this Protest which distinguishes it from any other Circular, addressed, whether by one or by several gentlemen in Congress, to their constituents or to the Public. Placed, therefore, as it has been by its authors, conspicuously before the country, it courts rather than deprecates the freest discussion of its contents.

Before entering into the merits of this Protest, let us also premise that we do not understand the gentlemen who have signed it as intending thereby to renounce fellowship with the Whig party. They themselves explicitly declare in their Protest their entire satisfaction with the Resolutions (the Platform) of the Whig Convention. They object only to the nomination of General Scott, condemned by them beforehand; and their objection to it is placed by them upon a single position, which, it seems to us, can hardly command the assent of unprejudiced persons.

Intending rather to take a historical and comparative view of this Protest than to attempt to argue it down, we shall but very briefly advert to the only specific objection which it offers to the nomination of Gen. Scott as the Whig candidate for the Presidency. We quote it as follows:

"[He (Gen. Scott)] obstinately refused, up to the time of his nomination, to give any public opinion in favor of that series of measures of the last Congress known as the Compromise: the permanent maintenance of which with us is a question of paramount importance. Nor has he since the nomination made any declaration of his approval of those measures as a final adjustment of the issues in controversy."

It is true the resolutions of the Convention that nominated him are as clear and as explicit upon this question as need be; but Gen. Scott, in his letter of acceptance, which contains all that we have from him on that matter, does not give them the approval of his judgment. This he evades studiously to have avoided. He accepts the nomination, "with the resolutions annexed." That is, he takes the nomination *cum onere*, as an individual takes an estate, with whatever incumbrances it may be loaded with. And the only pledge and guaranty he offers for his adherence to the principles of the resolutions are "the known incidents of a long public life," &c.

Before this paper will reach our readers, almost every one of them will have drawn his own conclusions from the face of this statement; and ninety-nine out of every hundred, we do not doubt, will have regarded it, as we have been obliged to do, as affording an altogether insufficient justification of the denunciation of the Whig candidate for the Presidency which has been sent forth.

Had General Scott been some obscure person, whose character and opinions were entirely unknown, there might be some ground for the stress laid by these gentlemen on the silence of which they insist upon accusing him. But here is a citizen whose whole manhood, for forty-four years, has been spent on the most public of public stages; who has been either a brave soldier or a victorious commander in every war and every difficulty in which his country has been involved during all that time—his earliest exploits achieved indeed before some of those who now doubt his loyalty were born; a man whose courage and conduct and peerless generalship are the admiration of other countries as they are the pride of his own; a man whose wisdom, prudence, and success in negotiating peace and in averting war are surpassed only by his splendor in arms; a man who has ever worn his opinions upon his sleeve; has ever been a Whig, and nothing but a Whig—a national and tolerant one—a most unexceptional one, the same in Georgia or Louisiana as in New York or Massachusetts; a man, moreover, who (even his opponents admit) exerted himself to the utmost, so far at least as official propriety permitted, to promote and accomplish the very acts of compromise to which these doubting and dissenting gentlemen now question his fidelity!

Why, gentlemen, the history of his life is a guaranty for his loyalty to the Constitution, to the Union, and to the South as well as the North. Even

though he had not, in terms, taken the Platform of the Whig Convention with the nomination, he has given hostages to honor and patriotism, and he could not, if a diadem were the price, be recreant to all his glorious antecedents, and to the blood that runs in his veins, as well as the blood which he has shed on the battle-field. What pledges did the Democrats exact of their candidate? They required none. They went upon known character and known opinions. Is the character of General Scott less known, or his sentiments more questionable? So far from this, indeed, there perhaps never was a man in any country whose profession removed him so entirely out of the sphere of politics, yet whose opinions on all public questions were so frankly expressed and so well known as those of General Scott. From such a man, of a character for patriotism and honor so unimpeachably sustained by almost half a century of faithful service and subordination to the Constitution and the Laws, no pledge ought to have been required.

Still, though not required, Gen. Scott did not hesitate, when the opportunity was afforded him, freely, voluntarily, and frankly, to offer the pledge which he was accused of having avoided. Of this charge of evasion, indeed, no other refutation ought to be required by impartial minds, than is supplied by his own direct and unequivocal language, in his Reply to the Letter of the President of the Convention:

"Not having written a word to procure this distinction, I lost not a moment, after it had been conferred, in addressing a letter to one of your members to signify what would be, at the proper time, the substance of my reply to the Convention; and I now have the honor to repeat, in a more formal manner, as the occasion justly demands, that I accept the nomination, with the resolutions annexed."

"The political principles and measures laid down in those resolutions are so broad that but little is left for me to add."

"Finally, for my strict adherence to the principles of the Whig party, as expressed in the resolutions of the Convention, and herein suggested, with a sincere and earnest purpose to advance the greatness and happiness of the Republic, and thus to cherish and encourage the cause of constitutional liberty throughout the world—avoiding every act and thought that might involve our country in an unjust or unnecessary war, or impair the faith of treaties, and discountenancing all political agitation injurious to the interests of society and dangerous to the Union—I can offer no other pledge or guarantee than the known incidents of a long public life, now undergoing the severest examination."

No one can more sincerely regret than we do that the authors of the Protest should not only have denounced the nomination of Gen. Scott, but have made public proclamation of their incurable hostility to his elevation to the trust for which he was recommended by the finally unanimous vote of the Whig Convention. This Manifesto of theirs may, through the influence of the popular names of the two leading Georgians to whom its paternity is generally ascribed, cause the loss of the State of Georgia, and perhaps of Alabama, to the Whigs. Of the aid of those States, however, the Whigs have not, at any time, had any certain assurance; and, should they now be lost to them, and in company with them even one or two other States, it is a consolation to reflect that there will still remain to the Whigs, without reckoning too closely, votes enough to place their candidate in the Presidential Chair.

By the admission which we have made of the possible effect of the Anti-Scott Manifesto upon the votes of one or more States, we have shown how highly we rate the personal influence, in their respective States, of the names by which it is sanctioned. In this admission, however, we have given the utmost latitude to our concessions. We can yield no more. We cannot, with our contemporary of the *Courier and Enquirer*, regard it as *an unimportant political manifesto*, "a demonstration as important in character as in extent," and with the accession of other names, (which the *Courier* anticipates,) as "an emphatic voice of reprobation of the Baltimore Nominee." The number of names signed to it is indeed larger than we could wish, considering the high positions which some of them at least have heretofore held in the Whig ranks.

We have, however, in our day, repeatedly witnessed similar outbursts of pent-up discontent, which—like fiery meteors, that suddenly exploding in a clear sky, light up the firmament for a brief space with a blaze of light, and descend below the horizon as suddenly as they emerged from it—have been the nine days' wonder of the time, and then fallen into oblivion, without having disturbed the order of Creation, or interrupted the calm course of human affairs. We say this without any intention to detract from the actual importance of the Protest, but with the design to bring to the notice of our Whig friends every where, and amongst them the authors of the publication we are speaking of, how wholly unavailing mere protests against the expressed will of a majority of the intelligence of the Nation, of whatever party, in favor of their preferred candidates, have ever been.

For examples of Protests of this kind we need not, indeed, to go very far back. No longer than four years ago such Protests were as plenty as blackberries. Need we recall to our readers the vehement protestations, by different associations and individuals, against the nomination of General Taylor by the Philadelphia Convention? Need we quote the Speeches of different Delegates to that Convention, literally *spurning* the nomination, and declaring the Whig party to be *thenceforth dissolved*? If the reader will set himself to thinking about it, he will need no reminder from us to satisfy him that the protestations and exhortations against the Whig candidates at that day, from professed Whigs, far exceeded in volume and violence those of the time present. Of this fact we might present many illustrations—we will content ourselves with one; and for that purpose select the protest of an important organization of Whigs in the great commercial metropolis of our country.

The Whigs of the city of New York absolutely declined, when called upon, to fix a day for holding a Ratification Meeting; and, on the same evening which they thus declined, the Young Men's "Henry Clay Club" assembled in the street, and, after listening to sundry exciting addresses from Whigs discontented with the Philadelphia Nomination of Gen. Taylor for President, put forth the following declaration, which was unanimously adopted, and "signed on the spot by five hundred new members."

"We, the undersigned, being deeply attached to Whig principles and measures, view with the deepest regret the nomination of a candidate for our suffrages who is not identified with the great fundamental principles of the Whig party—a man who has stated in his letters that he was willing to receive the nomination of any party."

"Is a declaration like this sufficient to allow us to concede him the deep and long-cherished principles which

have always been associated in our minds with the name of Whig?

"What guarantee have we as to the side on which, in the great political questions of the day, he will be found? None. The truth is, his availability is the groundwork upon which his nomination has been effected. Do we recognize or find this word in our creed? No. We despise and reject it! Therefore, we cannot and will not support General Taylor as our candidate for the Presidency! Devotion to our principles demand that we should not."

"To find such men as Clay, Scott, and Webster sacrificed in this manner, is an indignity we cannot tamely and quietly submit to. They have labored too long and faithfully to be thus abandoned."

"With either of these as our standard-bearer, we will fight ardently and (there is no questioning it) successfully; but with availability for our candidate, our zeal is palsied and our enthusiasm quenched."

Is there any thing in the recent Protest more dignified, more peremptory, or more positive, than the expressions in the foregoing Declaration from a thousand or two of the ardent and impulsive Whigs of the City of New York? Similar demonstrations were made at other points, in different States, and especially in Ohio and Massachusetts. And what was the result of all these partial but imposing indications of discontent? Why just this: that the election which was held exactly four months thereafter, not a single Whig Electoral Vote was given against Gen. Taylor for President in the whole United States!

So much for the consequence of discontent and protests against nominations by those whose desires or calculations happen to have been disappointed by them, in a case which is within the memory of every living man.

We now come to the purpose for which we have to-day taken pen in hand; which is to show to our readers that no elevation of virtue, no loftiness of intellect, no length or fidelity of public service, can conciliate the confidence, or even the esteem of all men in a Government so free as this, in which each individual is himself in some respects a sovereign, and particularly and above all, has an indefeasible property in his own opinions, and in the preferences and prejudices which are the fruits of their unrestrained enjoyment.

Even General Washington, whose name is now revered, not only by all Americans, but by all the civilized and even the savage world, beyond that of any mortal man that ever lived, was thwarted and opposed, during his civil career, (by a formidable array of talent, too,) with an intensity that embittered his life. Of the political opposition to Mr. Jefferson and the elder Adams, before and after each of them came to the discharge of the duties of President of the United States, we have not time now to speak, being in haste to come down to the time of the canvass for the Presidency at the expiration of Mr. Jefferson's second term of service after which, as our readers know, he retired to private life.

Up to this period, politicians, and of course the People, were divided, by a clearly-defined line, into two parties, the old Federal party, and the more modern party which called itself Republican. The chiefs of those parties being as well known as the principles on which they had divided, no public consultation by each party had ever been found necessary, as it is now, for the selection of their respective candidates for the Presidency. Mr. Adams beat Mr. Jefferson at the election of 1796, and Mr. Jefferson beat him at the election of 1800—in each case by close votes. At the election of 1804, Mr. Jefferson was re-elected for a second term by a nearly unanimous vote over CHARLES COTESWORTH PINCKNEY, a distinguished South Carolinian.

A little more than a year before the expiration of Mr. Jefferson's second term, the Republican party being still high in the ascendant, and several persons being presented by their friends and admirers as competitors for the succession, it became necessary to select one from among them. No other mode offered itself at once so practicable and so convenient, at that time, as a consultation of such of the Members of Congress, then in session, as claimed to belong to the Republican party. Such a conference was accordingly held (since termed a *Caucus*) on the 23d day of January, 1808, at which S. R. BRADLEY of Vermont presided, and RICHARD M. JOHNSON of Kentucky acted as Secretary; when JAMES MADISON was nominated for President—receiving eighty-three votes, GEORGE CLINTON three, and JAMES MONROE three. [Some absent members, afterwards acceding, added to the number.]

This nomination of Mr. Madison, who was at the time, and had been for seven years preceding, the Secretary of State under President Jefferson, realized the just expectation of the Republican party, and was received throughout the country with a general approbation, though not without a *Protest*, more numerous signed (by Members of the House of Representatives alone) than the recent Protest of the dissenters to the nomination of the Baltimore Convention, and much more vehemently denunciatory of the nominee than the latter. Among the signatures to it, as the reader will perceive, were some of the great names of that day, and among them that of JOHN RANDOLPH, who, though the last signer, was believed to be its author. The paper is quite too long to allow us to insert here at large, and we copy therefore only the close of it, which sums up the grounds of their opposition to Mr. Madison in terms of approbrium which it can hardly be believed, at this distance from the time, that any man of respectable standing could have applied to so upright, so patriotic, and so enlightened a man as JAMES MADISON.

EXTRACT FROM THE "PROTEST" OF 1808.

"We acknowledge that the aspect of our foreign affairs is unpropitious. We are perhaps on the eve of a war with one of the great Powers of Europe; we are therefore strongly impressed with the difficulties of our situation. In such a crisis, if unanimity in the choice of a President is necessary, that choice should be directed to a man eminently calculated by his tried energy and talents to conduct the nation with firmness and wisdom through the perils which surround it; to a man who had not in the hour of terror and persecution deserted his post and sought in obscurity and retirement a shelter from the political tempest; to a man not suspected of undue partiality or enmity to either of the present belligerent Powers; to a man who had not forfeited his claim to public confidence by recommending a shameful bargain with the unprincipled speculators of the Yazoo companies, a dishonorable compact with fraud and corruption."

"Is JAMES MADISON such a man? We ask for energy, and we are told of his moderation; we ask for talents, and the reply is his unassuming merit; we ask what were his services in the cause of public liberty, and we are directed to the pages of the Federalist, written in conjunction with Alexander Hamilton and John Jay, in which the most extravagant of their doctrines are maintained and propagated. We ask for consistency as a republican standing forth to stem the torrent of oppression, which once threatened to

overwhelm the liberties of the country; we ask for that high and honorable sense of duty which would at all times turn with abhorrence from any compromise with fraud and speculation. We ask in vain.

We do therefore, in the most solemn manner, protest against the proceedings of the meeting held in the Senate Chamber on the twenty-third day of January last, because we consider them—

As being in direct hostility to the principles of the Constitution:

As a gross assumption of power not delegated by the people, and not justified or extenuated by any actual necessity:

As an attempt to produce an undue bias in the ensuing election of President and Vice President, and virtually to transfer the appointment of those officers from the people to a majority of the two Houses of Congress.

And we do in the same manner protest against the nomination of James Madison, as we believe him to be unfit to fill the office of President in the present juncture of our affairs.

Joseph Clay, Abram Trigg, Noah Russell, Josiah Masters, George Clinton, Jr., Gordon S. Mumford, John Thompson, Peter Stuart, Edwin Gray, W. Hoge, Samuel Smith, Donl. Montgomery, John Harris, Saml. Maclay, David R. Williams, James M. Garnett, John Randolph.

CITY OF WASHINGTON, DECEMBER 27, 1808.

We put it to the reader, whether, if a case could ever occur in which, with a large and powerful adversary in front, a body of ambitious or discontented men might, by going over to the adversary party, with arms in their hands, effect the demolition of their own party, here would not have been such a case, had the venom of the assault been tempered by the exercise of even the smallest particle of discretion?

Now, even after such an abandonment as this of a candidate so nominated as Mr. Madison was, how did the People, the Republican People, reply to this persecution? Let the return of the Electoral votes answer the question. The whole number of Electors was 175:

For JAMES MADISON there were 122 votes.

For C. C. PINCKNEY 47 votes.

For GEORGE CLINTON (Dissentient) 6 votes.

By considerably more than two votes to one the People sustained the Republican ticket; and we appeal to the page of history and the verdict of posterity, already rendered, whether the People did not do right in sustaining this pure and spotless statesman against those who undertook to proscribe him?

When the first term of President MADISON was about expiring, (on the 18th of May, 1812,) at the very critical moment which preceded the War with Great Britain, in pursuance of a notice given to the Republican Members of Congress generally, a Meeting was held in the Senate Chamber, and, being organized, proceeded to nominate a candidate to be voted for as President of the United States at the election then ensuing. Mr. MADISON received the votes of all the members present. The malcontents at the preceding election (in 1808) refused to attend this meeting. But they held on to their animosity to Mr. MADISON. The Republicans of New York were cajoled into the belief that if they would make a State nomination of DE WITT CLINTON, they might, by the aid of other dissatisfied Republicans elsewhere, be enabled to elect him. A meeting of the Republican members of the New York Legislature was accordingly held on the 19th of May, and DE WITT CLINTON was nominated, by a pretty unanimous vote, as the candidate of the New York division of the Republican party for the Presidency, in opposition to Mr. MADISON. Beside the Whigs disaffected to Mr. MADISON, (the true representatives of the Republican principle in the Government,) the Federal party in mass voted for Mr. CLINTON. The People again sustained the illustrious MADISON against the Federal party and their allies from the Republican ranks, having re-chosen Mr. MADISON to the Presidency by a large majority of the Electoral votes.

We had got thus far in our historical notice of Nominating Conventions of the old Republican and present Whig parties, and were obliged to stop, without having filled up the half of the outline which we had in mind. At some future day we may perhaps resume and conclude the sketch.

We learn that Gen. SCOTT has already declined several invitations to be present at public meetings, and that he will continue to decline all such invitations pending the Presidential canvass.

CONGRESSIONAL NOMINATIONS IN MAINE.—

The Democrats of the Fifth Congressional District held a Convention at Exeter on the 6th instant; but, owing to dissensions in the party, were unable to agree upon a single candidate. HASTINGS STRICKLAND was first nominated, and ISAIAH WATERHOUSE was subsequently nominated by the dissatisfied portion of the Convention. This district is strongly Democratic, but, owing to a similar dissension two years ago, Hon. ISRAEL WASHBURN, the Whig candidate, was elected. Mr. W. is a candidate for re-election.

M. KOSSUTH is advertised to take passage for England in the steamer Washington, which sails from New York on Saturday next. His visit to the United States has lasted over seven months.

Capt. SWARTWOUT, of the U. S. Army, in command of Fort Meade, Florida, died at that post on the 1st instant.

JUDGE ISAAC T. PRESTON.—The New Orleans Delta has the following notice of Judge Preston, who perished in the destruction of the steamer St. James by fire, at that city, on the 6th instant:

Judge PRESTON was a native of Abingdon, Virginia, and brother of the eloquent W. C. PRESTON, and of JOHN S. PRESTON, of South Carolina. He came to New Orleans shortly after the war, in which he had been engaged in the North, having entered the army when war was declared. He has held several high offices in the State, having been more than once Attorney General, having been Judge of the First District Court, and at the time of his death one of the Judges of the Supreme Court of this State. He leaves a widow and a large family of children by his first wife.

The New Orleans Picayune of the 8th instant states that it had already been ascertained that more than thirty persons lost their lives by the late explosion of the steamer St. James, on Lake Pontchartrain.

Two witnesses, who refused to answer certain questions before the Grand Jury in Philadelphia, have been committed by Judge THOMPSON for contempt, although their counsel denied the power of the Court to commit for a contempt of this kind, except when the offence is committed in open court.

The United States sloop-of-war *Preble* left Annapolis last week, with upwards of one hundred souls on board, including the class of Midshipmen of the date of 1851, under Commander CHASE. The *Preble* will sail for the Azores and the Madeira Islands, and return about the first of September or October. The *Preble* is detailed for service every summer as a school of practice for the embryo officers of the navy.

DEATH OF GEN. ROGER JONES.

On Thursday evening last Death very suddenly removed from this community, and from a very large family circle, a most respectable and esteemed gentleman and a gallant and distinguished veteran of the Army. General ROGER JONES, for so many years Adjutant-General of the Army, died, at his residence in this city, after a very short illness, the evening before last. General JONES was in the 64th year of his age. He was a native of Virginia, and the elder brother of the gallant and respected Commodore CATESBY JONES, of the Navy. We never knew a more honorable gentleman, or one more estimable in all the domestic and social relations. His professional services and merits are familiar to the whole country. The eloquent "general orders," inserted in another column, of the General-in-Chief, his old brother in arms, do justice both to the personal and professional virtues of the deceased.

It was stated in the "Union" newspaper of the 13th instant that JOHN M. CLAYTON, of Delaware, Ex-Senator, advocated an alteration of the fugitive slave law in a ratification Speech in favor of Gen. SCOTT's election in Delaware some days ago. Now, we are assured by one who heard that speech that the "Union" has done gross injustice to Mr. CLAYTON, who advocated the ratification of the Whig Platform at Baltimore, embracing a settlement of all questions touching the subject of slavery. Mr. CLAYTON is known to have been the draughtsman of the resolutions proclaiming the finality of the Compromise measures adopted at the Whig meeting at Delaware City, which we published some time ago, to refute the assertions made in the "Union" that the friends of Gen. SCOTT had in no instance been known to express themselves in favor of regarding the fugitive-slave-law, and other measures of the Congress of 1850 on the subject of slavery, as a final settlement, and as deprecating all further agitation of the questions involved in them. But this is not all. Mr. CLAYTON was the draughtsman and author of the strong resolutions in support of the Compromise measures adopted at the Whig State meeting at the Capital of Delaware, when Gen. SCOTT was nominated in that State, and went to Baltimore as a Delegate instructed to sustain the very platform which the Whigs adopted.

In the Whig Convention at Baltimore, Mr. CLAYTON was one of the committee which drew up the Whig Platform, and was most active and influential in securing the consent of Northern gentlemen to the resolutions on the subject of the Compromise. All the delegates in that committee will attest this fact, and they will further say that no man among them took more pains to reconcile all sections on the distracting questions of the day than JOHN M. CLAYTON, of Delaware.

Occupying a position in a slave State, bounded both on the north and east by non-slaveholding communities, Mr. CLAYTON maintained the same character at Baltimore which he has ever sustained in public life, and at no time more conspicuously than when he brought forward that great measure of peace, called the "Clayton Compromise," which passed the Senate by an overwhelming majority, and was defeated in the House by a majority of only four or five votes.

Our friend, from whom we derive these facts, informs us that Mr. CLAYTON, in the speech delivered at a Ratification Meeting in favor of Gen. SCOTT, and referred to in the "Union," labored with the utmost zeal to induce his hearers to adopt the Whig Platform on the subject of slavery, and triumphantly succeeded in his object. Instead of opposing the fugitive-slave law with a view to deprive the slaveholder of his rights, he pointed out what he considered was a defect in the eighth and ninth sections of the act, the legitimate construction of which appeared not to justify the payment of the expenses necessarily incident to the delivery of a fugitive from labor, as it does not allow any expenses except those accruing after the affidavit of rescue or the order to deliver the slave. Should this be the construction of the act, he said, it would require amendment; and we think no Southern man, residing in a slave State, as he does, would differ from him. He stated, if our information be correct, that the costs in the "Sims case," the payment of which depended on this construction of the act, were about twelve thousand dollars; and the costs in other cases, before the affidavit of rescue or order to deliver, often ranged from one to five thousand dollars.

If these costs should not be paid under the act, he submitted to the people of Delaware his opinion that the fugitive law was defective, and ought to be amended for the purpose of securing a compliance with the constitutional provision which commands the delivery of the fugitive, as the payment of such enormous costs by the owner would make the act inoperative. These were the views of Mr. CLAYTON, and are known by his friends to have been his sentiments, freely expressed to all who desired to learn them.

In this connexion let us add that gross injustice has been done to the memory of Gen. TAYLOR in reporting him as ever having opposed the fugitive-slave law. We have the highest authority for saying that neither he nor his Cabinet ever opposed that law. General TAYLOR, Mr. CLAYTON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. PRESTON, and Mr. CLAWFORD were known to all their friends as advocates of that measure before its passage. They constituted a majority of the Cabinet, and we do not believe that any member of Gen. TAYLOR's Cabinet ever made any opposition to the bill.

THE WHIGS OF VERMONT.—A large gathering of Whigs took place at Burlington (Vt.) on Monday evening. Addresses were made by Chas. F. Davey, and Mr. Weston of Burlington, Nathaniel Ellmaker of Pennsylvania, H. J. Raymond of New York, and others. Speaking of the meeting, the "Free Press" remarks:

"The Whigs of Vermont are just as true and certain for the Whig cause now as when the morning drum-beat called them to the support of the honest and pure-hearted Harrison. They cannot be beaten by any form or combination of Locofocoism, nor by side-issues, or immaterial issues, or false issues."

THE CANAL.—The water is now in the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal throughout its whole length, and it is expected that boats laden with coal will leave Cumberland on Monday next for Georgetown and Alexandria.

SPIRIT OF THE PRESS.—With the exception of some few instances in Massachusetts and Georgia, the nomination of SCOTT and GRAHAM has been welcomed in the warmest manner. And even in these two States many of the people are beginning to respond with great enthusiasm. In every State, with the exceptions named, the good old banner is floating above the platform which our patriotic delegates created at Baltimore, and the rallying cry from many a hill and valley is sent up by the people, "The Union of the Whigs for the sake of the UNION!" There will be no faltering among the Whigs this summer. They will give their opponents a greater defeat than in the Harrison campaign.—*Natchez (Miss.) Courier.*

SILVERCREEK LOSS OF EIGHTY-SEVEN LIVES.—The British barque *Trinity*, from Port Seaborough, England, for Quebec, with 124 passengers, was totally wrecked on a reef of Cape Gaspe, on the afternoon of the 22d of June, and thirteen of the passengers and five of the crew were drowned in attempting to land. Two schooners arrived at Quebec on the 7th instant, with part of the crew and passengers; the remainder of those saved were on their way to the same port in another schooner.

THE LATE MR. MCKENNA.

The Washington (Penn.) Reporter of Wednesday last comes to us clothed in black habiliment, mourning over the decease of Mr. MCKENNA, which we announced to our readers some days ago. In the editorial account of his life, which is full of interest, we find the following allusion to an incident which we never heard of before, but which is worthy of record here:

"When President TAYLOR passed through this place in 1849, on his way to Washington, he sought out Mr. MCKENNA, whom he had never before seen, and expressed to him his high appreciation of his talents, his wisdom, and his great integrity. He also expressed a desire to have him in the Cabinet, as one whose counsel he needed, and upon whom he could rely. Circumstances to which we need not allude prevented a consummation of this desire of Gen. TAYLOR; but it is sufficient to say that Mr. MCKENNA was averse to taking office, and much preferred the less exciting and more congenial tasks of home."

The following traits of his character as a legislator and a lawyer are strikingly characteristic:

"As a politician, Mr. MCKENNA was a firm, liberal, and conscientious Whig. He was never violent, but always active. His influence with his party in this county was unbounded. In Congress he occupied a prominent position, commanding general respect. With a stalwart frame, and a voice like a Bonaparte, he always made himself heard when he desired it; and the general respect entertained for him gave him, in connexion with his other qualities, a power over a stormy House which few others possessed. When a noisy time was expected in Committee of the Whole, Mr. MCKENNA was the man relied on to preside.

"As a lawyer, Mr. MCKENNA had an almost omnipotent power with both court and jury. His varied and extensive knowledge of the law, his honesty, love of justice, and stern integrity gave him an influence which we never knew any other man to possess. An instance in point is related, where a jury was unable to agree, and asked the court for its instructions. The point of difficulty was stated; when the court told the jury that it had already instructed them on that point. 'Yes,' said a juror, 'but Mr. McKenna differed with the court on that point.' The jury were sent back, and when they returned a verdict was rendered according to the law as laid down by Mr. MCKENNA. The case was taken to the supreme court, and the verdict was sustained. The jury, doubtless, should have taken the law as laid down by the court, as juries generally do; but the fact that they broke over a general practice in not doing so shows not only the extent of his influence in the jury-box, but the confidence of the jury in his legal judgment. His reputation in this particular made him always in demand in criminal cases; but so upright and honest was he, and so strong was his love for justice, that he never undertook a defence in which he was not satisfied that he had the right."

THE "NATIONAL UNION" MOVEMENT.

We copy below, as a curiosity, the call for a "National Union Convention" which is so often referred to by the Opposition press. It is evidently a device of the enemy. It has been distributed from Philadelphia to various parts of the country, and is accompanied by no name or names. When the delegates from the States therein referred to are elected? And what States do they represent? It is one of the most shallow attempts at imposition that ever came under our notice. Here is a copy of the call:

"A National Union Convention will be held in the city of Philadelphia on the first day of August, 1852, for the nomination of DANIEL WEBSTER for the Presidency of the United States, and a suitable candidate for the Vice Presidency, for the support of the Union Party of the Nation in November next."

"Delegates from ten States now hold themselves in readiness for this step; other States are requested to choose suitable representatives without delay."

"Friends of the Union and of its great champion, you are now called upon to give evidence of your devotion to that cause, which has enlisted the talents of the most eminent and the sympathies of a mighty nation."

"The immediate formation of local Webster Union Associations is earnestly recommended."

THE UNION OF THE DEMOCRACY.

The Charleston Mercury, in copying the resolutions lately adopted at a Democratic meeting held in Greenville, South Carolina, accompanies them with the following not very complimentary remarks:

"It will be observed that one of them rejoices over the reunion of the Democratic party. Now, this reunion, so far as it is real, is an amalgamation of the Union or Compromise, the Southern Rights and the Free soil parties, and all of them professing to have given up no principle. It is quite clear, then, that the object of that union is nothing but party success in the approaching election, and that the South must share it (if indeed the South is not cheated of all share) with the Free-soilers."

We copy two of the resolutions:

"Resolved, That, inasmuch as we are denied the right, the appropriate, and constitutional right of the people, to vote for President and Vice President, as is done in every other State of this Confederacy, we do therefore instruct our members of the Legislature to exert all their influence in procuring the vote of South Carolina to be cast for Pierce and King, the nominees of the Democratic party."

"Resolved, That, although fighting for equality, constitutional rights, and republican principles in the Federal Government, we are not the less regardless of the same privileges, rights, and principles in our own State, and under her own constitution; we do therefore instruct and require our representatives in the next Legislature to ask for and demand, in the name of the people of South Carolina, the right of voting for President and Vice President, the right of equal representation in the Legislature, and the right of electing their own Governor by popular vote, as is the case in all these particulars in every other State in the Federal Union."

Among the passengers in the steamer Africa, which left New York on Wednesday for Liverpool, was LOUIS KOSSUTH, Ex-Governor of Hungary. His name was not in the list of passengers published, and it is said he went on board only a few minutes before the vessel departed. Various surmises have been started as to the cause of his sudden departure.—*Journal of Commerce.*

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT. By and with the advice and consent of the Senate. WILLIAM CARL LAZE, to be Governor of the Territory of New Mexico, in the place of James S. Calhoun, deceased.

C. W. C. DUNNINGTON, to be a Justice of the Peace in the county of Washington, in the District of Columbia.

A SIGN.—It is a fact worthy of notice that the organs of each of the two great parties into which the nation is divided are endeavoring to fix upon the candidate of the opposing party the stigma of having, in some way or other, and at some time or other, expressed dissatisfaction with the